

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 17 November 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claims 3-8 have been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification because it was replete with improper idiomatic English. The Examiner required a Substitute Specification.

Accordingly, the Specification has been amended to correct the numerous idiomatic, grammatical and translational errors found therein. A clean copy of the Substitute Specification and Abstract are attached to this Amendment in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125. The Substitute Specification and Abstract each includes the same changes as are indicated in the marked-up copy of the original Specification and Abstract. It is believed that the

subject matter disclosed by the Substitute Specification was previously disclosed in the Specification and Claims, as filed, and the accompanying Drawing Figures. No new matter has been added by these changes.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings because the labels were not in proper idiomatic English. Accordingly, corrected formal Drawings for Figs. 2 and 3 are attached hereto as replacements for the original Drawings for Figs. 2 and 3.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Crownover, U.S. Patent 3,915,850. The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Crownover and further in view of official notice that robot arms are notoriously well known in the industry for the purposes of automation and efficiency. Therefore, the Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to have used at least one robot arm to move a

group of ejected chips in Crownover. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that the subject Patent Application disclosed allowable subject matter in that each designation bin of each different grade of chip is assigned during chip testing, such that the first chip tested determines the grade designation of the closest bin.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the step of determining if a bin has been assigned to the established grade and if the bin has not been assigned, assigning the established grade to correspond with a closest available bin. As admitted by the Examiner, the Crownover reference neither discloses nor suggests a method wherein each destination bin of each different grade of chip is assigned during chip testing, with the first chip tested determining the grade designation of the closest bin in each subsequent different grade being assigned to the next closest available bin.

As the reference fails to disclose each and every one of the method steps of the invention of the subject Patent Application, it

cannot anticipate that invention. Further, as the reference fails to suggest such a combination of steps, it cannot make obvious that invention either.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *17 Feb. 2005*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586